

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful consideration of the subject application. The Advisory Action mailed December 15, 2008 has been carefully considered. In the previous Final Office Action Claims 1-14 are rejected and Claims 1-14 remain pending. Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 USC 112 as being indefinite. Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 USC 102. Claims 1 and 8 were amended with the filing of this response. No new matter was added with the filing of this response and the amendments are supported, at least, by the application at page 19 lines 5-7 and Figure 6 and Page 12 lines 18-20, and Page 13 lines 1-7. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, removal of the rejections, and that the application be placed in condition for allowance based on the amendments and the arguments herein.

Rejections under 35 USC 112

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-14 as being indefinite under 35 USC 112. Specifically, Claims 1-4 were rejected as indefinite because the Office Action stated that support was not found for the term "source storage system." With respect to this phrase Applicants would respectfully direct attention to the last paragraph of page 13 of the instant application which states:

The simulation system or tool 114 may be used to determine the feasibility of consolidating a number of storage systems to fewer or newer data storage system units, this is sometimes referred to as a "merge" operation. The tool is useful for examining and calculating the utilization of components within the system to be consolidated or merged, such a system may be referred to as a **source** for a consolidating or merging operation.

Applicants would respectfully assert that this paragraph provides adequate support for the term "source storage system" and would respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC 102

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-14 under 35 USC 102 in light of Friedrich (US Patent No. 5,276,877). While Applicants assert that Friedrich does not anticipate the claimed invention, Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 8 to more clearly claim the current invention. Applicants assert that Friedrich does not have each and every element of the amended claims which is necessary for a 35 USC 102 rejection.

Friedrich, column 2 lines 53-56, states his method is directed to “display of a computer system’s configuration along with elected system metrics.” Friedrich states, column 2, lines 61-65, that he provides a “[m]ethod of evaluating the performance of a computer system described by a configuration representing physical devices, the connections of the physical devices in the computer system, and workloads which are process that use system resources provided by the physical devices.” Further, at Column 3, lines 14-16, Friedrich states that his invention is “for use in modeling a computer system containing a plurality of physical devices supporting a plurality of workloads. . .” Friedrich also states his computer system “contains two busses, NI bus 103 and CI bus 106,” “CPUs” and “HSC (hierarchical storage controller) 140 manages communications between disks and CI bus.”

However, Applicants respectfully assert that Friedrich does not disclose Claim 1 or Claim 8 as Friedrich does not disclose a “data storage system comprising front end controllers coupled to a cache memory and a back end coupled to the cache, the back end comprising back end controllers coupled to a plurality of storage components.” The Office Action seems to agree with this assertion as it stated the “target data storage system comprising a plurality of storage components” was equivalent to “each of the CPU’s being simulated including their attached

disks.” However, Applicants respectfully assert that Friedrich does not disclose “front end controllers” and a “back end” where “the back end comprising back end controllers coupled to a plurality of storage components. Further, as Applicants assert that Friedrich does not disclose a “back end,” Friedrich can not disclose “optimizing the backend end of the target storage system.”

Friedrich does not contain all of the claimed elements of the current invention and Applicants assert it can not be used as a proper 35 USC 102 rejection. First, Friedrich is directed to “modeling a computer system containing a plurality of physical devices supporting a plurality of workloads.” Applicants assert this suggests that Friedrich discloses a computer. Disclosing only a computer for his “modeling,” Applicants assert Friedrich does not disclose, at least “[a] data storage system comprising front end controllers coupled to a cache memory and a back end coupled to the cache, the back end comprising back end controllers coupled to a plurality of storage components.”

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Friedrich does not disclose all the elements of Claims 1 and 8. Not disclosing all of the elements of the claimed inventions, Applicants assert that Friedrich can not properly be used for a 35 USC 102 rejection. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request this rejection be removed and Claims 1 and 8 be placed in condition for allowance. As Claims 2-7 and 9-14 depend on Claims 1 and 8, Applicants assert that Claims 2-7 and 9-14 should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants believe that the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable reconsideration.

In the event the Examiner deems personal contact desirable in the disposition of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (508) 293-7450.

Please charge all fees occasioned by this submission to Deposit Account No. 05-0889.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 19, 2008

/Joseph D'Angelo/
Joseph D'Angelo (Reg. No. 56,800)
Attorney for Applicants
EMC Corporation
Office of General Counsel
176 South Street
Hopkinton, MA 01748
Telephone: (508) 293-7450
Facsimile: (508) 293-7189